

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Applicant appreciates the time and effort by the Examiner in reviewing this application. In the Action, the Examiner alleges that the application contains claims are directed to two (2) patentably distinct inventions. Group I, Claims 1-34 are drawn to discovering pertinent inputs in a repository and is classified in class 707 subclass 3. Group II, Claim 35 is drawn to project management, classified in class 717 subclass 101. By the Action, Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed invention for prosecution.

Accordingly, Applicant disagrees, at least in part, with the Examiner's reasoning for the election/restriction, but nevertheless hereby elects **Group I, Claims 1-34 drawn to discovering pertinent inputs in a repository and is classified in class 707 subclass 3.** Applicant reserves the right to file Divisional applications on the non-elected invention.

The applicant respectfully submits that there are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions:

- (A) The inventions must be independent (see MPEP § 802.01, § 806.04, § 808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP § 806.05 -§ 806.05(i)); and
- (B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP § 803.02, § 806.04(a) -§ 806.04(i), § 808.01(a), and § 808.02).

The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the election/restriction pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.143, provides the reasons therefore below, and provisionally elects Group I, Claims 1-34.

While Applicants believe no fee is due with this transmission, if any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2126 of Garlick, Harrison and Markison.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert A. McLauchlan
Reg. No. 44,924
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Dated: January 19, 2007

Garlick Harrison Markison
P.O. Box 160727
Austin, Texas 78716-0727
(512) 339-4100
(512) 692-2529 (Fax)